



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/583,715	05/30/2000	Masakazu Ohshita	0057-4990-2	1713

22850 7590 01/15/2004

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

PARK, CHAN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2622

DATE MAILED: 01/15/2004

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/583,715

Applicant(s)

OHSHITA, MASAKAZU

Examiner

CHAN S PARK

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment was received on 10/27/03, and has been entered and made of record. Currently, **claims 1-25** are pending.

Drawings

2. The corrected or substitute drawings were received on 10/27/03. These drawings are acceptable.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 1, 8, 11, 15, and 23-25** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
4. Upon review of the reference of Sato et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,926,616), which was cited in the Office action dated 9/11/03 under 35 U.S.C 102(e), as anticipating **claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 11, 15, 19, and 23-25**, the examiner notes that the reference can still be interpreted as anticipating the claims, as currently amended.

Particularly, as amended, **claim 1** now requires "multiplying first linearly aligned dots of **odd lines** in the main-scanning direction X by a positive integer D_y " and "multiplying second linearly aligned dots of **even lines** in the main-scanning direction X by a positive integer R_y ." Further, the applicant has argued that Sato et al. does not disclose or suggest an operation in which the multiplying integers, D_y and R_y , can be different.

Art Unit: 2622

However, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., Ry and Dy being different) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

With respect to the amended claim, the Sato et al. reference clearly discloses that the linearly aligned dots of **both even and odd lines** in both main and sub scanning directions X and Y of the original bit mapped image data by $m=3$ (col. 4, lines 38-41). Again, since the applicant never discloses the Dy and Ry being different variables in the currently amended claims, the Office believes that Dy and Ry can be equal.

Since the other independent claims are similarly amended, the rejections for the claims are also fully supported by the Sato et al. reference.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 11, 15, 19, and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sato et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,926,616.

1. With respect to claim 1, the Sato et al. reference discloses an image data processing method (fig. 1) for processing original image data that is bit mapped (col. 4, line 24) in a main-scanning direction X and a sub-scanning direction Y (col. 4, lines 24-29), the method comprising:

First multiplying first linearly aligned dots of odd lines in the main-scanning direction X of the original bit mapped image data by a positive integer D_y ($m=3$) to generate D_y lines of linearly aligned dots adjoining each other in the sub-scanning direction Y as a first group of the sub-scanning direction Y (col. 4, lines 38-41 & 8 in fig. 1);

Second multiplying second linearly aligned dots in the main-scanning direction X of the original bit mapped image data, which follow the first linearly aligned dots, by a positive integer R_y ($m=3$) to generate R_y lines of linearly aligned dots adjoining each

other in the sub-scanning direction Y as a second group of the sub-scanning direction Y (col. 2, lines 13-15); and

Multiplying further following linearly aligned dots in the main-scanning direction X of the original bit mapped image data by repeating said first and second multiplying (fig. 8).

Referring to figs. 1, 8A, and 8B in the Sato et al. reference, they disclose a method of multiplying a horizontally aligned line of dots in each original image line by integer ($m=3$) to increase the resolution of it. The method discloses all the limitations of claim 1 of creating multiple dots from linearly aligned dots in the main-scanning direction X. Also, refer to col. 6, lines 45-46.

2. With respect to claim 3, the Sato et al. reference further discloses an image data processing method (fig. 1) comprising:

Third multiplying dots at a first position of the main-scanning direction X of the original bit mapped image data by a positive integer D_x ($m=3$) to generate D_x dots adjoining each other in the main-scanning direction X as a first group of the main-scanning direction X (col. 4, lines 38-41 & 8 in fig. 1);

Fourth multiplying dots at a second position of the main-scanning direction X, following the first position, of the original bit-mapped image data by a positive integer R_x to generate R_x dots adjoining each other in the main-scanning direction X as a second group of the main-scanning direction X (col. 2, lines 13-15); and

Multiplying dots at further following positions in the main-scanning direction X of the original bit mapped image data by repeating the third and fourth multiplying steps.

Referring to figs. 1, 8A, and 8B in the Sato et al. reference, they disclose a method of multiplying each dots in each original image line by integer ($m=3$) to increase the resolution of it. The method discloses all the limitations of claim 1 of creating multiple dots from linearly aligned dots in the main-scanning direction X. Also, refer to col. 6, lines 45-46.

3. With respect to claim 4, the Sato et al. reference further discloses the positive integer D_y for the sub-scanning direction Y and the positive integer D_x for the main-scanning direction X being satisfied a required output image resolution, and the positive integer R_y for the sub-scanning direction Y and the positive integer R_x for the main-scanning direction X being satisfied a required output magnification ratio.

By using applicant's disclosed formulas (1 & 2 on page 19) of calculating the image resolution, the image resolution of the Sato et al. reference is calculated.

$(D_y + R_y)/2 = D_{PloutY}/D_{PlinY}$, wherein $D_y = m = 3$, $R_y = m = 3$, $D_{PloutY} = 3$, and $D_{PlinY} = 1$. $(3+3)/2 = 3/1 = 3$ thus, it satisfies the image resolution.

$(D_x + R_x)/2 = D_{PloutX}/D_{PlinX}$, wherein $D_x = m = 3$, $R_x = m = 3$, $D_{PloutX} = 3$, and $D_{PlinX} = 1$. $(3+3)/2 = 3/1 = 3$ thus, it satisfies the image resolution.

Also, by using applicant's disclosed formula (5 & 6 on page 20) of calculating the magnification ratio, the magnification ratio of the Sato et al. reference is calculated.

$R_y0 = (D_y + R_y)/2$, wherein $D_y = m = 3$ and $R_y = m = 3$. $R_y0 = 3$ thus, it satisfies the magnification ratio.

$R_x0 = (D_x + R_x)/2$, wherein $D_x = m = 3$ and $R_x = m = 3$. $R_x0 = 3$ thus, it satisfies the magnification ratio.

4. With respect to claim 8, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1 and 3, are applicable. Also, see fig. 8.

5. With respect to claim 11, the Sato et al. reference discloses all the limitations of claim 11 as noted above in arguments for claim 1, except:

Having a memory device for storing integer values for D_y , R_y , and the original bit mapped image;

Having a memory control device configured to circularly and repetitively store data of linearly aligned dots and the multiplied dots; and

Having a data output device configured to output the circularly and repetitively stored data in the image memory device.

According to the reference, however, it also discloses a page length memory for storing a numeric value indicating the number of lines (col. 12, lines 48-53). Having known the method of storing data and having taught the method of multiplying original image dots to increase the resolution, it is inherent to have a memory device either RAM or ROM for storing D_y , R_y , and the original bit mapped image to achieve the enhancement of the image. It is also inherent to have a memory device for storing the multiplied dot data to output to the image forming device or a data output device.

6. With respect to claim 15, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 3 and 11, are applicable.

7. With respect to claim 19, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1 and 11, are applicable.

Art Unit: 2622

8. With respect to claim 23, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1 and 11, are applicable.
9. With respect to claim 24, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 3 and 11, are applicable.
10. With respect to claim 25, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1, 3, and 11, are applicable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12-14, 16-18, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Shimomae et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,327,260.

11. With respect to claim 2, as noted above, the Sato et al. reference discloses all the limitations of claim 1 but it does not disclose the method of generating correcting dots for reducing jagged image of the multiplied bit mapped image. On the other hand, in the applicant's admitted reference as a prior art, the Shimomae et al. reference further discloses a dot corrector (7 in fig. 2) for reducing jagged images of the sampled

Art Unit: 2622

dots (col. 3, lines 1-5). Sato et al. and Shimomae et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor that is the printing art. Therefore, having known the method of multiplying original image dots to increase resolution by Sato et al. and the method of reducing jagged image by Shimomae et al., it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine two methods to both increase resolution and reduce the jagged image generated by multiplying original image dots.

12. With respect to claim 5, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 2, are applicable.

13. With respect to claim 6, as noted above, the Sato et al. reference discloses all the limitations of claim 1 but it does not disclose the further limitations of claim 6. On the other hand, in the applicant's admitted reference as a prior art, the Shimomae et al. reference further discloses steps comprising:

Recognizing shapes of boundaries between a black dot region and a white dot region in a region including a target dot being multiplied and dots surrounding the target dot of the bit mapped image (step (b) on page 4);

Generating code information corresponding to the recognized shapes (step (b) on page 4);

Generating corrected dot data according to the generated code information (step (d) on page 4);

Sato et al. and Shimomae et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor that is the printing art.

Art Unit: 2622

Having known the dot multiplying method by Sato et al. and corrected dot data generating method by Shimomae et al., it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace data of which dot have been generated in the dot multiplying steps with the generated corrected dot data and repeat from the recognizing step to the replacing step while changing the target dot one to the other.

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the Shimomae et al. method of recognizing boundary and generating corrected dot according to the code information to the Sato et al. method of increasing resolution. One would have been motivated to combine the two references to recognize the jagged boundary created from increasing the resolution and to smooth the jagged image (col. 3, lines 1-5 & col. 3, lines 12-46).

14. With respect to claim 7, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 6, are applicable.

15. With respect to claim 9, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 2, are applicable.

16. With respect to claim 10, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 6, are applicable.

17. With respect to claim 12, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 2 and 6, are applicable.

18. With respect to claim 13, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1 and 6, are applicable.

Art Unit: 2622

19. With respect to claim 14, as noted above, the combination of Sato et al. and Shimomae et al. references discloses all the limitations of claim 13 but it does not disclose the further limitations of claim 14. On the other hand, in the applicant's admitted reference as a prior art, the Shimomae et al. reference further discloses the method of counting the multiplied dots at an identical location in sub-scanning direction Y and initializing the count to zero when latter count reaches the desired integer multiplying value (step (c) on page 4). It also discloses the method of outputting dot data corresponding to the code information (step (d) on page 4).

20. With respect to claim 16, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 2 and 6, are applicable.

21. With respect to claim 17, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1 and 6, are applicable.

22. With respect to claim 18, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 14, are applicable.

23. With respect to claim 20, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 2 and 6, are applicable.

24. With respect to claim 21, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1 and 6, are applicable.

25. With respect to claim 22, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 14, are applicable.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHAN S PARK whose telephone number is (703) 305-2448. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on (703) 305-4712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.

Chan S. Park
January 9, 2004


EDWARD COLES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600